

REMARKS

This Amendment is fully responsive to the final Office Action dated November 19, 2008, issued in connection with the above-identified application. Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. With this Amendment, claim 10 has been amended. No new matter has been introduced by the amendments made to the claims. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 6, 8-12 and 14-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Naoki et al. (Japanese Patent Application No. 2000-091083, hereafter "Naoki") in view of Birnstock et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,417,371, hereafter "Birnstock").

The Applicants traverse the rejection noted above for at least the reasons noted below. The Applicants assert that the cited prior art fails to disclose or suggest all the features recited in at least independent claims 1 and 10. For example, claim 1 recites the following features:

"[a] production method of an organic light emitting element comprising:

forming each layer of a transparent electrode and a metal layer sequentially on a transparent substrate;

forming a first electrode composed of the transparent electrode and the metal layer, the first electrode having a same width as a pixel;

exposing a strip-shaped area of the transparent electrode of the first electrode by removing the metal layer intersecting the transparent electrode which corresponds to the pixel, a size of the pixel being specified by a pair of opposite edges of the transparent electrode and a pair of opposite edges of the metal layer at the exposed strip-shaped area of the transparent electrode;

forming an organic layer to coat the exposed strip-shaped area of the transparent electrode; and

forming a second electrode on the organic layer."

The features noted above in independent claim 1 are similarly recited in independent claim 10 (as amended). Additionally, the features noted above are fully supported by the Applicants' disclosure (see Fig. 2; and Pg. 5, lines 21-25).

The present invention (as recited in independent claims 1 and 10) is distinguishable over

the cited prior art in that each layer of a transparent electrode and a metal layer are formed sequentially on a transparent substrate" and a first electrode composed of the transparent electrode and the metal layer are formed such that the first electrode has a width of the pixel."

Additionally, the pixel of the present invention (as recited in independent claims 1 and 10) is a size that is specified by a pair of opposite edges of the transparent electrode and a pair of opposite edges of the metal layer, and the width of the pixel in the intersecting direction is identical with the width of the transparent electrode. The edges of the pixel formed by the edges of the transparent electrode do not include the transparent electrode and metal layer outside of the pixel.

In the case of linearly arranging the pixels provided by a plurality of respective organic light emitting elements, the edges of the pixel formed by the edges of the transparent electrode are facing each other, so that it is possible to arrange the uniform size of pixels at extremely minute intervals and form them easily. Therefore, it is possible to produce a downsized linear beam irradiator with uniform luminance. No such features or advantages are believed to be disclosed or suggested by the cited prior art.

In the Office Action, the Examiner relies on Naoki and Birnstock for disclosing of suggesting all the features recited in independent claims 1 and 10. Specifically, the Examiner indicates that Naoki fails to disclose or suggest that "the size of a pixel is specified by a pair of opposite edges of the transparent electrode and a pair of opposite edges of the metal layer at the exposed strip-shaped area of the transparent electrode." However, the Examiner relies on Birnstock for overcoming the deficiencies noted above in Naoki (see Office Action, Pg. 3, lines 9-19, and Pg. 6, line 18 to Pg. 7 line 8). However, the Applicants disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of Birnstock.

Birnstock discloses a passive-matrix powered display with structured pixels and a structured electrode based on electroluminescent polymers. In Birnstock, a first insulating coating 5 with windows 10 surrounds the outlines of the pixels, and encloses an organic polymer solution with the windows 10 (see col. 4, line 62 to col. 5, line 2; col. 6, line 3-10; col. 9, line 6-10; and Fig. 7). As described in Birnstock, a short circuit between the metal cathode and the indium-tin-

oxide (ITO) may be prevented by the insulating coating 5 as well as a short circuit between neighboring cathode tracks (see col. 9, line 10-15). Thus, when the teachings of Birnstock are applied to the pixel defining layer in Naoki, the pixel (at best) would be surrounded with the pixel defining layer having a function of enclosing the organic polymer. That is to say, the metal layer exists around the pixels.

Thus, the combination of Birnstock and Naoki is still clearly different from the present invention (as recited in independent claims 1 and 10). For example, claim 1 (and similarly recited in claim 10) recites "forming each layer of a transparent electrode and a metal layer sequentially on a transparent substrate" and "forming a first electrode composed of the transparent electrode and the metal layer, the first electrode having a width of the pixel."

Additionally, the pixel of the present invention (as recited in independent claims 1 and 10) is a size that is specified by a pair of opposite edges of the transparent electrode and a pair of opposite edges of the metal layer, and the width of the pixel in the intersecting direction is identical with the width of the transparent electrode. The edges of the pixel formed by the edges of the transparent electrode do not include the transparent electrode and metal layer outside of the pixel.

In case of linearly arranging the pixels provided by a plurality of respective organic light emitting elements, the edges of the pixel formed by the edges of the transparent electrode are facing each other, so that it is possible to arrange the uniform size of pixels at extremely minute intervals and form them easily. Therefore, it is possible to produce a downsized linear beam irradiator with uniform luminance.

As described above, the combination of Naoki and Birnstock provides a structure where the metal layer exists around the pixels, and a metal layer exists between the pixels. Accordingly, in the combination of Naoki and Birnstock (in the case of arranging the pixels of the plurality of organic light emitting elements linearly), the intervals between the pixels are larger than that of the present invention. Therefore, the present invention (as recited in independent claims 1 and 10) is clearly distinguishable over the combination of Naoki and Birnstock.

Based on the above discussion, no combination of Naoki and Birnstock would result in, or otherwise render obvious, independent claims 1 and 10. Similarly, no combination of Naoki and Birnstock would result in, or otherwise render obvious, claims 2-4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12 and 14-20 at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 10.

In the Office Action, claims 5, 7 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Naoki in view of Birnstock, and further in view of Hosokawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,280,861, hereafter "Hosokawa"). Claims 5 and 7 depend from independent claim 1; and claim 13 depends from independent claim 10. As noted above, Naoki in view of Birnstock fails to disclose or suggest all the features recited in independent claims 1 and 10. Additionally, Hosokawa fails to overcome the deficiencies noted above in Naoki and Birnstock. Accordingly, no combination of Naoki, Birnstock and Hosokawa would result in, or otherwise render obvious, claims 5, 7 and 13 at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 10.

In light of the above, the Applicants respectfully submit that all the pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections presented in the outstanding Office Action, and pass this application to issue. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Tsuneharu TOMITA et al.

/Mark D. Pratt/

By: 2009.02.18 16:16:56 -05'00'

Mark D. Pratt
Registration No. 45,794
Attorney for Applicants

MDP/ats
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
February 18, 2009